

## Anacostia Trash Loads calculated w/ SF Trash Generation Rates

		SF Bay Loading Rates (lbs/acre)			Annual L
Aggregated Land Use Category	Acres	Low	Best	High	Low
<b>Upper Anacostia</b>					
Low Density Residential	1,697.57	SF rates for residential land use were d not density, making comparis			
Low/Medium Density Residential	1,267.54				
Medium Density Residential	657.71				
High Density Residential	19.31				
Commerical	431.04	0.48	4.22	11.76	205.18
Industrial	259.86	1.90	5.71	12.10	494.77
Institutional <sup>b</sup>	585.69	0.48	4.22	11.76	278.79
Major Roads, Transport, Communications, Utilities	624.51	No corresponding land use catego			
Public Facilities <sup>b</sup>	304.92	0.48	4.22	11.76	145.14
Federal Facilities <sup>b</sup>	67.84	0.48	4.22	11.76	32.29
Parking	12.22	No corresponding land use catego			
Parks and Open Spaces	1,401.13	0.34	3.40	7.75	476.38
<b>Lower Anacostia</b>					
Low Density Residential	204.38	SF rates for residential land use were d not density, making comparis			
Low/Medium Density Residential	158.16				
Medium Density Residential	263.00				
High Density Residential	46.05				
Commerical	155.67	0.48	4.22	11.76	74.10
Industrial	33.00	1.90	5.71	12.10	62.83
Institutional <sup>b</sup>	69.41	0.48	4.22	11.76	33.04
Major Roads, Transport, Communications, Utilities	81.09	No corresponding land use catego			
Public Facilities <sup>b</sup>	243.73	0.48	4.22	11.76	116.02
Federal Facilities <sup>b</sup>	240.17	0.48	4.22	11.76	114.32
Parking	-	No corresponding land use catego			
Parks and Open Spaces	421.81	0.34	3.40	7.75	143.42

<sup>a</sup> SF rates converted from gal/acre to lbs/acre using average trash density of 0.68 lbs/gal

<sup>b</sup> Applied SF rate for "Commercial & Services" to DC categories for Institutional, Public Facilities, and Federal Fa

Load (lbs) (using SF Bay rates)		Existing Load from Trash TMDL
Best	High	
Determined by income, comparisons difficult		7,667.80
		5,023.20
		9,101.70
		153.10
1,817.26	5,070.75	9,519.10
1,484.32	3,145.35	4,911.00
2,469.27	6,890.06	14,905.80
Determined by income, comparisons difficult		19,433.50
1,285.54	3,587.08	7,760.20
286.01	798.07	867.20
Determined by income, comparisons difficult		83.60
4,763.84	10,861.56	447.8
Determined by income, comparisons difficult		923.20
		626.80
		3,639.50
		365.00
656.30	1,831.30	3,437.90
188.50	399.43	623.6
292.63	816.54	1,766.40
Determined by income, comparisons difficult		2,523.50
1,027.57	2,867.24	6,202.90
1,012.56	2,825.36	3,070.30
Determined by income, comparisons difficult		0.00
1,434.15	3,269.87	135

cilities

**Table 4.2.** San Francisco Bay Area annual trash

Land Use	Low
Commercial & Services	0.7
Industrial	2.8
Residential*	
Less than \$50,000/yr	2.8-30
\$50,000-\$100,000/yr	0.9-2.1
Greater than \$100,000/yr	0.3-0.5
Retail*	
Less than \$50,000/yr	10.4-11.1
\$50,000-\$100,000/yr	2.1-10.4
Greater than \$100,000/yr	0.7-2.1
K-12 Schools	3
Urban Parks	0.5

\* For residential and retail land uses, trash generation rate is based on household median income.

\* For residential and retail land uses: Low = 5% confidence interval; High = 95% confidence interval; and, Low = 10% percentile.

#### Observations:

1. Direct comparisons difficult due to differences in land use and population density.
2. Comparisons for residential uses particularly difficult due to differences in household income.
3. SF study did not attribute loadings to roads or highways.
4. Where comparisons were possible, DC TMDL loading rates were generally higher than SF study loading rates.

ash generation rates for stormwater (gal/acre).

	<b>Best<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>High<sup>a</sup></b>
	<b>6.2</b>	17.3
	<b>8.4</b>	17.8
2	<b>8.2-87.1</b>	24.2-257
8	<b>2.5-8.2</b>	7.4-24.2
9	<b>0.5-2.5</b>	1.0-7.4
10	<b>78.2-150</b>	202-389
4	<b>15.5-78.2</b>	40.0-202
1	<b>1.8-15.5</b>	4.6-40.0
	<b>6.2</b>	11.5
	<b>5.0</b>	11.4

ites are provided as a range, which takes into account the correlation

ice interval; Best = best fit regression line between generation rates and interval. For all other land use categories: High = 90<sup>th</sup> percentile; Best = mean

ences in land use classifications between DC and SF

arly difficult as SF categorized by income and not density

ds/transportation, which are among the highest loading categories in DC

ADL loads are substantially higher than what would be calculated using SF's comparable